

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the present application, areas of a display of a page are reduced in size to compensate for magnification of other portions of the page to maintain the integrity and/or configuration of the page. Magnified and reduced areas of a display are presented by using varying shades of color and a pattern densities which correspond to the magnification or reduction ratio of areas of the display. The areas that have been magnified and/or reduced are presented by varying color intensity; areas reduced in size are displayed with a deep hue in color to indicate that the area is compressed and a magnified area is displayed with a lighter color to indicate its expansion. As a result, changes in color intensity, in correspondence to the magnification or the deduction ratio distinguish such changed areas from one another and from unchanged areas. Moreover, images of the display can be presented with a specification corresponding to each magnification or reduction ratio by linking the display with a movement of a pointing device, thus realizing a very easy-to-operate user interface.

**I. Rejection Under 35 USC 103(e)**

Claims 5, 6, 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Gould (6,219,052).

As pointed out above, the present application discloses displaying magnified and reduced portions of a diagram differently from each other and from unchanged portions of the diagram. Figure 11 of Gould, and its description in the specification, does not teach displaying portions distinctly in three separate categories. In Figure

11 of Gould, portions are shown at most in only two different categories; the enlarged salient portions 61 and all other portions all of which have been shrunk or condensed.

Claims 5, 6, 9, 10 and 12 can all be distinguished from the Gould references for the above reasons. Independent claims 5 and 9 both call for means or software “displaying each portion of the diagram”... “so that the pattern densities of different portions of the diagram are characterized differently from each other and from unchanged portions of the diagram” (emphasis added). Since all portions are displayed in Figure 11 as either expanded or shrunk, the expanded or shrunk portions of the diagram are not displayed differently from unchanged portions since there are no unchanged portions in the display. Dependent claims 6, 10 and 12 further distinguish from the Gould patent in that they add further structure to the unanticipated combinations recited in claims 5 and 9.

## II. Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

A. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gould patent (6,219,052) in view of Masushi JP publication 11-109945.

As pointed out above, only two categories of image portions are displayed at one time in Figure 11 of Gould. From the abstract of Masashi, it appears that only one power of magnification is displayed at one time and that the level of magnification is not distinguished by a change in the color of the objects magnified but by a change in the color of a frame surrounding the object. Since neither reference of the combination teaches displaying portions of a diagram in three

different categories of expansion, it would not be obvious to combine the teaching of the two references to teach such displaying of portions in three different categories. Further since in Masashi different portions of the diagram are not changed in color with changes in magnification, it would not be obvious to display diagram portions in different colors depending on its magnification or reduction since that is not disclosed in either reference.

Claim 1 is patentable over the prior art for the reasons given above. It like claims 5 and 9 calls for displaying the magnified and reduced portions differently from the unchanged portions of the diagram. Further it calls for coloring the expanded diagram and the accompanying scale. Since neither of the applied references discloses or suggests either of the above factors, the claimed subject matter would not be obvious to those skilled in the art.

B. Claims 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niles (Gould ??) as applied to claim 1 (5) above in view of Sakuma et al. (5,323,173).

While the rejection cites the Niles patent in reference of a discussion to its application with respect to claim 1, it appears from the following subject matter that the Examiner is applying the Gould reference application to claim 5 and not claim 1. (With respect to the Niles patent, its inapplicability to the present invention was covered in the last response of the applicant.)

As for the Gould patent, the applicant's comments with respect to independent claims 5 and 9 apply equally well to dependent claims 7 and 11.

Therefore claims 7 and 11 distinguish over the prior art for the reasons given above with respect to claim 5 and 9.

C. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of the Gould and Masashi, further in view of the Smith patent (5,737,507).

As pointed out with respect to claim 1 in section B above, the combination of Gould and Masashi fail to disclose certain factors claimed in claim 1 and as a result, claim 1 is patentable over the combination. Claims 13 and 14 are patentable over the prior art for the same reasons as claim 1. Further, nothing in the Smith patent discloses using the pointer to change the shade of color which results from expanding a display area, as called for in claim 1.

D. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould in view of Smith.

Claims 15 and 18 are patentable over Gould and Smith for reasons given above in sections A and C.

E. Claims 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould with respect to claims 5 and 9.

As pointed out previously, Gould does not anticipate the subject matter of claims 6 and 18. Claims 16 and 19 distinguish over the Gould reference for the reasons given with respect to claim 5 in section A. Further, the recited combination

of colors and numbers together as claimed in this claim is not notoriously old to indicate shrinkage in size of the various segments of a diagram. For this reason claims 16 and 19 are patentable over the prior art since it was not obvious to those skilled in the art to use the pointing device as disclosed for modification of color as claimed in this claim.


F. Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being unpatentable over Gould and Smith in view of Kojiima. Claims 17 and 20 are patentable over the Gould and Smith references for reasons given in claim 1, 5 and 16. Nothing in the Kajiima adds anything in the combination of Smith and Gould. Further, there is nothing in the Gould patent suggesting reducing character size in areas around a magnified portion, as claimed in these claims. For this reason both claims 17 and 20 are patentable over the combination cited in this section D.

### III. Rejections under 35 USC 112

Contrary to the Examiner's position, the application clearly discloses linking numbers to colors in a bar graph as shown in Figures 2B and 2C to indicate which sections have been magnified or reduced. Further, this bar graph 212 is sufficiently described in the description beginning in the next to last line of page 5 and continuing on to page 6.

For these and other reasons, the application is in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that it be reexamined, allowed and passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James E. Murray", is written over a horizontal line.

James E. Murray - Attorney

Registration No.: 20,915

Telephone No.: (845) 462-4763